



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,135	12/19/2000	Carl Chang	25609.00010	2531
7590	12/08/2005		EXAMINER	
JoANNE S. REDMAN LINER YANKELEVITZ SUNSHINE & REGENSTREIF LLP 1100 GLENDON AVENUE 14 TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90024			LE, HIEU C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	
DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/752,135

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Hieu c. Le

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12-19-00 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 7/19/05 has been entered and made record.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because the drawings are not clear to read. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 45 recites the limitation "said set of application interfaces" in lines 8-9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 45-49, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang '99 et al. "Rule Mitigated Collaboration Technology", IEEE , p. 137, p. 142, Dec 1999 and in view Chang '97 et al, "Chang et al. "Research on Collaboration Net", 6th IEEE Workshop on Future Trends of Distributed Computing Systems (FTDCS '97) 1997; p. 228- p. 233.

As to claim 45, Chang '99 discloses a system for providing and monitoring electronic collaboration among users comprising:

means for Internet access (p. 137, Lc, lines 23-38);

a meeting environment (p, 140, RC, lines 20-24); and

means for allowing mitigation of a set of protocol rules within said meeting environment (p, 140, RC, lines 20-24); and

an object based client-server architecture functionally supporting said meeting

Art Unit: 2142

environment and said means for allowing mitigation of said set of protocol rules by virtue of said set of application interfaces which allow communication between said means for allowing mitigation of said set of protocol rules and said meeting environment (p, 141, Lc, line 22, Rc, line 34);

Chang '99 disclose an electronic meeting that takes advantage of the capacity of electronic networks to handle multiple simultaneous communication channels (p.139, Lc, lines 25-27).

Chang '99 does not explicitly disclose means for Internet access, and wherein said set of protocol rules is based on Robert's Rules of Order and is created by a colored petri net.

Chang '97 discloses a client server collaboration distributed systems that uses WWW (Internet) session and floor control rules for meeting such as the Robert's Rules Order (RRO) and the colored Petri Net (CPN) to model an extended RRO(p. 228, Rc, line 1- p. 229, Lc, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Chang '97 's teachings to modify the system of Chang' 99 by using the Internet , and wherein said set of protocol rules is based on Robert's Rules of Order and is created by a colored petri net in order to adaptor and model the old fashioned RRO to the modern net-centric virtual conference where time synchronism is hard to enforce. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Robert's Rules of Order and a colored petri net used the web meeting are concurrent by Chang

Art Unit: 2142

'99 in order to allow users to work on a same document at the same time such as DistEdit, and Lotus notes which support both asynchronous and synchronous collaborations, and to employ by Chang '97 in order to meet the requirement of the rich semantics of CPN in particular (page. 229, Lc, lines 1-9).

As to Claim 46, Chang '99 further disclose comprising:

a meeting registration function [a plan a must be established before meeting may be called (meeting registration function) (p. 138, Rc, lines 23-27)];

a meeting call to order function (Fig. 2);

a meeting list [an agenda for the meeting is a meeting list (p. 138, Rc, lines 28-34)];

a meeting floor (p. 138, Rc, lines 14-19);

a means to control said meeting floor (p. 138, Rc, lines 14-19);

a means to make motions (p. 138, Rc, lines 1-8) ; and

an adjournment function (p. 139, Lc, first four lines).

As claim 47, Chang '99 discloses a method for providing and monitoring electronic collaboration among users, comprising the steps of:

accessing an electronic environment supported by an object based client-server architecture (p. 141, Lc, lines 22-29);

communicating through said electronic environment supported by said object based client-server architecture (Fig. 6); and

applying a set of protocol rules within said electronic environment by virtue of said object based client-server architecture (p. 141, Rc, lines 1-4);

Chang '99 does not explicitly disclose wherein said set of protocol rules is based on Robert's Rules of Order and is created by a colored petri net.

Chang '97 discloses a client server collaboration distributed systems that uses WWW (Internet) session and floor control rules for meeting such as the Robert's Rules Order (RRO) and the colored Petri Net (CPN) to model an extended RRO(p. 228, Rc, line 1- p. 229, Lc, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Chang '97 's teachings to modify the system of Chang' 99 by the set of protocol rules is based on Robert's Rules of Order and is created by a colored petri net in order to adaptor and model the old fashioned RRO to the modern net-centric virtual conference where time synchronism is hard to enforce. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Robert's Rules of Order and a colored petri net used the web meeting are concurrent by Chang '99 in order to allow users to work on a same document at the same time such as DistEdit, and Lotus notes which support both asynchronous and synchronous collaborations, and to employ by Chang '97 in order to meet the requirement of the rich semantics of CPN in particular (page. 229, Lc, lines 1-9).

As to claim 48, Chang '99 further discloses
accessing an electronic environment supported by an object based client-server architecture (p. 141, Lc, lines 22-29);
communicating through said electronic environment supported by said object based client-server architecture (Fig. 6); and

applying a set of protocol rules within said electronic environment by virtue of said object based client-server architecture (p. 141, Rc, lines 1-4);

wherein said object based client-server architecture comprises a collaboration server, a collaboration client, a domain server, and a set of middleware components (Fig. 6, p. 141, Rc, lines 5-34);

Chang '99 does not explicitly disclose wherein said set of protocol rules is based on Robert's Rules of Order and is created by a colored petri net.

Chang '97 discloses a client server collaboration distributed systems that uses WWW (Internet) session and floor control rules for meeting such as the Robert's Rules Order (RRO) and the colored Petri Net (CPN) to model an extended RRO(p. 228, Rc, line 1- p. 229, Lc, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Chang '97 's teachings to modify the system of Chang' 99 by the set of protocol rules is based on Robert's Rules of Order and is created by a colored petri net in order to adaptor and model the old fashioned RRO to the modern net-centric virtual conference where time synchronism is hard to enforce. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Robert's Rules of Order and a colored petri net used the web meeting are concurrent by Chang '99 in order to allow users to work on a same document at the same time such as DistEdit, and Lotus notes which support both asynchronous and synchronous collaborations, and to employ by Chang '97 in order to meet the requirement of the rich semantics of CPN in particular (page. 229, Lc, lines 1-9).

Art Unit: 2142

As to claim 49, refer to claim 46 rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-3897.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached on (571) 272-3868.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 273-8300.

Hieu Le

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Caldwell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Andrew" and last name "Caldwell" clearly distinguishable.

**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**